

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office action of 5 Mar 2007.

Claims 1, 10-13, 17, and 19 are in the case, none as yet allowed.

35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1, 10-13, 17, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not complying with the enablement requirement. The Examiner apparently could not find sufficient support in the specification detailing how the generation of a goods receipt is used to approve and pay for an invoice.

In response, applicant calls to the attention of the Examiner the following material from page 9, lines 2-22 of the specification:

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the purchase order 87, vendor 48 returns an invoice 89 to SAP server 42 requesting payment for the goods or services. Responsive to receipt of invoice 89, SAP 42 prepares and communicates transaction information 404 to RCW 40, and RCW 40 provides that information in transaction notification 65 to requestor 46 in a format, such as a window or frame, including the transaction information 404 and a selection device, such as buttons 406 and 408, or the like, for accepting

or rejecting the invoice.

In the event that requestor 46 accepts the invoice, or authorizes payment, an automated goods received (move ticket) is generated back to SAP system 42 and payment made without further human intervention.
[Emphasis added.]

Applicant represents that the material above quoted provides to those of skill in the art a sufficient understanding of how the goods receipt (referred to above as a transaction notification 65 for an invoice 89 which has been accepted 406 by requestor 46) is used to generate a move ticket back to SAP system 42 which will pay the invoice.

Applicant's invention, however, is not directed to the payment of the invoice, but rather to the generation of the receipt.

When a invoice is received from a vendor which includes an item marked as "receipt required", payment is blocked and notification sent to the user. The user responds by returning an approved receipt which is posted to remove the block and approve payment of invoice.

Applicant requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 be reconsidered and withdrawn, that claims 1, 10-13, 17, and 19 be allowed.

35 U.S.C. 103

The Examiner interprets "generating a goods receipt for approving an invoice" to mean "comparing an invoice to a receipt." That such "generating" includes "comparing" is correct.

Claims 1, 10, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Maners, U.S. Patent 6,507,826 in view of *University of New Hampshire Financial and Administrative Procedures*, hereinafter, *Procedures*.

Claims 13, 17, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Maners in view of *Procedures* and further in view of Furphy et al. U.S. Patent 6,882,983.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Maners in view of *Procedures*, and further in view of Barnes et al., U.S. Patent 5,970,475.

In rejecting these claims, the Examiner asserts several concepts as being obvious, drawing on his own many years as an accountant and, of course, the cited art.

With respect to claim 1, at page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner seems to be equating invoices above and below a certain amount to those which relate to receivable and non-receivable commodities (in determining whether to execute a negative or positive confirmation process). This is not the meaning set forth in applicant's specification at page 13. Applicant has amended claim 1 to more clearly define commodities.

Applicants invention is represented as being particularly useful for goods and services not coming through a receiving dock, including automating preparation of a move ticket responsive to requestor entered positive confirmation [Specification, page 4, lines 15-19].

Commodities that typically designated as needing positive confirmation are those that would not flow through a traditional receiving dock where a dock worker takes parts off a truck, counts them, and then creates a receipt transaction into an application which bridges to the accounts payable system where a three way match would occur.

In applicant's invention, the commodities where positive confirmation would be configured are those like services. Examples of such services includes a painter painting an office, an electrician wiring a room, and a telecommunications worker installing a network router. The business that receives benefit from such services and pays for them does not want the invoices from the vendor for these services paid until a person explicitly concludes that the service was done and done to specification.

In applicant's invention, the way the positive confirmation process occurs this is: an invoice arrives and is checked against the purchase order. It is determined that the purchase order item referenced on the received invoice has a positive confirmation designated commodity (that is, a receivable commodity) for which there is no existing receipt, such as may be expected from a dock worker for commodities which do flow through a receiving dock. In accordance with applicant's invention, the system uses the

invoice information to send a positive confirmation notice to the requester. That requester must respond to the positive confirmation notice. The response can be either: do not pay or pay it. If the response is to pay it, a good or service receipt is generated. Once that receipt reaches accounts payable (as an automated receipt transaction file), the three way match occurs and the invoice will be accepted for payment. Applicants are not claiming to be the first to do three way match. Rather, the novelty resides in the way the receipt for the goods or services is generated from the invoice and purchase order and submitted by the requester.

Further with respect to claim 1, at page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Procedures teaches three-way match, and it would be obvious to combine Procedures with Maners.

The process taught by Maners is as follows. An invoice arrives for which there is no receipt. Consequently, the invoice is not accepted for payment. A purchasing person would then must investigate the missing receipt. To do so, he would need to contact the requester to see if the goods/service was received/performed. If the answer is yes, the purchasing person would then contact a person that had access and authorization to create receipts. That person would then create the missing receipt which would flow to accounts payable where the three way match would take place. Applicants claimed process for generating the receipt, as described above, improves on this procedure. Consequently, the combination of Maners and the three-way match taught by Procedures do not teach applicant's process for generating receipts.

With respect to claim 10, at page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that front-end and back-end processing are not claimed in sufficient detail to clearly demark them.

Applicant has amended claim 10 to more clearly demark the front-end and back-end systems.

With respect to claim 11, at pages 9-10 of the Office Action the Examiner asserts the obviousness of combining Maners and Barnes regarding posting (page 6).

Applicant notes that the claimed invention is not directed to the fact that posting a receipt causes an invoice to be paid. Rather, applicant's invention is directed to the manner in which to collect the receipt from the requester responsive to the arrival of an invoice from the supplier. Applicant is not merely claiming that doing a receipt triggers payment. Rather, it is the process of generating that receipt. The combination of Barnes, Maners and Procedures does not teach this process.

With respect to claim 12, applicant has amended the claim to depend from claim 10, which now distinguishes Maners and Procedures as previously described with respect to claims 1 and 10.

With respect to claim 13, 17 and 19, the Examiner refers to claims 1 and 10. Applicant has previously discussed the distinctions with respect to Maners and Procedures.

With respect to Furphy, in applicant's invention, when an invoice is received and it is determined that the invoice includes a mismatch, that is a commodity marked as receivable for which a receipt has not been previously generated, an E-mail request is sent to the original requestor (not the buyer) to generate the receipt. ("Separation of duties" requires that applicant not request such of the buyer.) Applicants resolve the mismatch by requiring that the original requestor provide a positive confirmation response.

Thus, applicant's invention relates to the generation of the receipt of goods. Goods designated as receivable and which are received through the receiving dock will have that receipt generated by receiving dock personnel, whereas goods designated as receivable and which are not received through the receiving dock will have that receipt generated by the original requestor, which latter receipt is requested by an e-mail request directly to that requestor.

Furphy, on the other hand, is silent on the process implemented for generating the receipt. Furphy provides a single interactive platform 15 for processing transaction data for both buying companies and selling companies (Col. 5, at line 12). At col. 7, line 60ff, Furphy teaches that receiving documents provide receipt data corresponding to the products actually received by the buying company, which will then be combined with information from the purchase order to determine the total cost of goods received. At col. 8, line 38ff Furphy describes the resolution of non-matching charge codes, and requesting resolution from buyers or default buyers. At col. 9, line 34 ff Furphy describes

that further processing is executed when receipt data and invoices do not match, and at col. 11, line 56ff the use of rules-based schemes to resolve differences, and at col. 12, line 1ff the use of a workflow process for resolving charge code discrepancies. Similarly, at col. 15, line 57 ff Furphy refers to resolving discrepancies between purchase order data, invoice data, and receipt data.

However, in none of these teachings, nor elsewhere in the reference, does Furphy teach applicant's claimed process (as described in the second preceding paragraph) for generating goods receipts, as distinguished from the subsequent use of such receipts in the purchase order, invoice, goods receipt three-way match.

Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly define the process for generating the receipt document, and requests that they be allowed.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendment be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1, 10-13, 17, and 19.

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive

assistance and suggestions in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

C. S. Baumann, et al.

By

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Shelley M Beckstrand", written over a horizontal line.

Shelley M Beckstrand

Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 3 May 2007

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.

Patent Attorney

61 Glenmont Road

Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Phone: (276) 238-1972

Fax: (276) 238-1545